



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—On Certain Effects of Elision.

By M. W. HUMPHREYS,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

Although some of the facts which are discussed in this paper have been mentioned by others, still it may not be out of place to state that all of them were observed by myself before I knew that attention had been called to them, and that I have arrived at all my conclusions by independent investigation.

#### § 1. QUASI-CAESURA IN GREEK.

Having once had occasion to find examples of iambic trimeters without any main caesura, I observed that nearly all such had an elision so placed that if the elided vowel were pronounced there would be *caesura*. This, as I have since learned, was observed by Porson, who calls it *quasi-caesura* (a name which I adopt), but offers no explanation of the phenomenon. This elision may take place either at the end of a polysyllable, as Ajax 435 :

τὰ πρῶτα καλλιστεῖ || ἀριστεύσας στρατοῦ,

or in the postpositive or enclitic monosyllables τε, γε, με, δέ, etc., as Theb. 538 :

οὐ μὴν ἀκόμπαστός γ' ἐφίσταται πύλαις.

In such instances I have no doubt that the Greeks (who ordinarily made their elisions *total*) slightly pronounced the elided vowel, so that the effect of caesura was in some measure produced. But to this view there seems at first sight to be an objection. When the reader had come to the place for the penthemimeral caesura and found elision instead, how was he to know whether to make his caesura there or not, as the main caesura might be *hephthemimeral*? That is, in such a verse as,

κἀγὼ μαθοῦσ' ἔλεξ', ὁ δ' ἐσσύθη μόνος,

how was the reader (and especially the reciter, for in reciting you cannot think ahead) to know whether he was to make caesura by slightly sounding the -a of *μαθοῦσα*, or was to wait

for the hephthemimeral caesura? This difficulty would evidently debar writers from employing quasi-caesura at the end of the first dipody under ordinary circumstances, and hence we actually find that it is admitted as the equivalent only of the hephthemimeral caesura. Certain exceptions which were to be expected will presently be explained.

It should be observed that verses with quasi-caesura *seem* to have diaeresis in the middle, which would be a grave fault. Now G. Hermann, who rejects the caesura in the fourth foot, must of course reject quasi-caesura also, and this he does by attributing it to chance. Accordingly he asks how it came that Aeschylus and Sophocles neglected the elision (when they used diaeresis in the middle) more than Euripides, who, he says, was so much more careless than they. We ask in reply how it came that there was any great difference between the usage of Euripides and that of the others, if it was all due to chance. And besides, a verse containing what Hermann regards as an unsuitable substitute for caesura, might well be made by one whom he considers an inferior metrician. But I deny that Euripides was more careless than the others. In fact he is in some respects the most polished and versatile metrician of the three. His frequent resolutions which give variety and life to the verse, being subject to strict limitations, are no evidence of carelessness or of deficiency. Moreover, he does *not* admit the quasi-caesura more frequently; whereas the diaeresis in the middle, without elision and without any main caesura elsewhere, the rest sometimes admit, but Euripides virtually never.

Hermann's position demanded of him to show that there were many verses entirely without main caesura, and in attempting to do this (*Elementa*, p. 111) he produced the following supposed instances from *Oed. Rex*: 326, 449, 598, 599, 615, 738, 744, 785, 809, 1290, 1476. But of these eleven verses, *four have the quasi-caesura*, and one more (449) has the ordinary hephthemimeral caesura:

λέγω δέ σοι, τὸν ἄνδρα || τοῦτον ὃν πάλαι,

and in another (598), *αὐτοῖσι πάντα* is to be read for *αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα*:

τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν αὐτοῖσι || πάντ' ἐνταῦθ' ἔνι.

(Some write  $\pi\tilde{a}v$  for  $\pi\acute{\alpha}v\tau'$ .) And so the number of verses wanting caesura is reduced from eleven to five; and one of these five (615) has a break between a preposition and a noun, which is not the same as no caesura at all; for if in this instance we regard the preposition and its object as one metrical word, the third and fourth feet would then be made up out of one word:

$\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\tilde{a}v\ |\ \acute{\epsilon}v\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}ρ\alpha\ |\ \gamma\nu\acute{o}\iota\eta\varsigma\ \mu\iota\tilde{\alpha},$

which Hermann himself in another place correctly regards as the worst sort of verse. Still another of the five has a break between an enclitic and a word preceding it, which break is better than total absence of caesura for the same reason that applies to the verse just mentioned, for if the two words form one metrical word, we have

$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta\iota\pi\lambda\acute{o}\tau\iota\varsigma\ |\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}v\tau\rho\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\nu\ |\ \kappa\alpha\tilde{\theta}\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron.$

So that there are really *three* verses without main caesura, and *four* with quasi-caesura; or even allowing him to count the two I have just mentioned, the ratio is still only *five* to *four*, and that too in a play that seems to have been especially selected for making the ratio seem great. Now if the four out of nine instances suffer elision by chance, and the same ratio is sustained in other plays, we must conclude that regularly four words in nine suffer elision, which is not true. But in fact, the other plays of the Tragedians not only sustain the ratio in favor of elision, but show that the instances of elision vastly exceed those of its absence in such verses.

Hermann, further opposing quasi-caesura, compares the verses

$\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \acute{o}v\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota},\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{o}\nu;\$   
 $\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\eta\varsigma,\ \tau\acute{o}\theta'\ \eta\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \nu\tilde{\omega}\nu,$

with these,

$\kappa\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon,\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta' \cdot\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\tilde{\omega}\ \tau\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\ \Pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu.$   
 $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\tilde{\xi}\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha,$

affirming that they are of the same sort. In reference to the two former he says: "Who will believe that the actor recited them in any other way than as was suited to the sense? for if rhythm and not sense is to be observed in reciting, there is no reason why breaks should not be made even in

the middle of words" (a thing, by the way, which he himself had just done on the same page in discussing another subject). Accordingly he regards the main caesura as being replaced in all these verses by diaeresis in the middle. Without denying that this ever happens, I think that, although in the above two verses which have no elision we place a comma after the third foot, still the actor, in order to emphasize *σὺ* and *τόδ'* and so express their relation to *πόλις* and *ἔταν*, made his caesurae respectively after *σὺ* and *τόδ'*; for if we read these verses according to the sense we are almost compelled to make that sort of rhetorical pause and change of tone which best suits caesura. And then we may ask in turn who will believe that the actor recited . . . *φείδεσθ' ἐγὼ* . . . without pronouncing the elided vowel, especially as Hermann himself requires us to make a pause at such places.

In order to prove beyond all doubt that this elision at the middle of the verse cannot be attributed to accident, I shall first collect from one play of each Tragedian the examples of verses that have no main caesura, but have diaeresis in the middle, and see how many of them have elision at the diaeresis; and then I shall give the results of a similar examination of all the extant tragedies. And in so doing I shall first take account of those verses where the sense seems to require the chief pause to be at the diaeresis, whether there be caesura or not, and then I shall drop out the verses which contain a caesura of any sort in the third or the fourth foot, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to what I mean by caesura. I shall, therefore, temporarily place caesurae at places where I do not believe they belong. I use Dindorf's text.

First, then, I find in *ÆSCH.* *Theb.* the following:

1. With elision after the third foot:

- 252: οὐκ ἐς φθόρον σιγῶς' || ἀνασχέσει τάδε.  
 385: σείει, κρίνους χαιτῶμ', || ὑπ' | ἀσπίδος δὲ τῷ—  
 410: τιμῶντα καὶ στυγοῦνθ' || ὑπέρφρονας λόγους.  
 426: πύργοις δ' ἀπειλεῖ | δαίν', || ἂ | μὴ κραινοὶ τύχη.  
 544: ὡς πλεῖστ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ | τῷδ' || ἰάπτεσθαι βέλη.  
 562: θεῶν θελόντων | ἂν δ' || ἀληθεύσαιμ' ἐγώ.

- 635: ἀλώσιμον παιᾶν' || ἐπεξιαχάσας.  
 637: ἦ ζῶντ' ἀτιμαστῆρ' || ὅπως ἀνδρῆλάτην—  
 799: καλῶς ἔχει τὰ | πλεῖστ' || ἐν | ἐξ πυλώμασιν—  
 1005: δοκοῦντα καὶ δόξαντ' || ἀπαγγέλλειν με χρῆ—  
 1007: Ἑτεοκλέα μὲν | τόνδ' || ἐπ' | εὐνοίᾳ χθονὸς—  
 1012: οὕτω μὲν ἀμφὶ | τοῦδ' || ἐπέσταλται λέγειν.  
 1053: ἀλλ' αὐτόβουλος | ἴσθ', || ἀπεννέπω δ' ἐγώ.

## 2. Without elision :

- 457: καὶ μὴν τὸν ἐντεῦθεν || λαχόντα πρὸς πύλαις.  
 632: λέξω, τὸν αὐτοῦ | σου || κασίγνητον, πόλει—  
 695: φίλον γὰρ ἐχθρά | μοι || πατρός τάλαιν' ἀρά—  
 702: θεοῖς μὲν ἤδη | πως || παρημελήμεθα.  
 1046: ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στυγεῖ, || σὺ | τιμήσεις τάφω.

Here we have thirteen instances with elision against five without it. Now let us drop out all the verses that have any break in the third or fourth foot: in the first group, 385, 426, 544, 562, 799, 1007, 1012, 1053 being dropped, five remain; in the second group all but the first being dropped, only one remains; and it will be observed that in 632 *σοῦ* might well be written, and I have already shown that caesura belongs after *σύ* in 1046. In 695 *φίλον* goes with *πατρός* and in 702 *πως* modifies the word after it, so that these two verses, at any rate, must be read almost continuously; and hence the rejection of all four of these verses is proper enough, while most of the verses rejected from the other group would have to be strained in order to place the caesura elsewhere; and seeing that elision at the diaeresis certainly answered for caesura, we should be justified in retaining the whole list as instances of quasi-caesura.

Secondly, I find in SOPH. Antig. the following :

1. With elision after the third foot, vv. 44, 57, 74, 77, 80, 307, 399, 407, 408, 473, 515, 658, 732, 733, 764, 1012,—sixteen in all. The peculiar verse 544,

μήτοι, κασιγνήτη, μ' ἀτιμάσῃς τὸ μὴ οὐ—,

which really belongs here, I omit entirely, as it might be disputed.

2. Without elision, vv. 327, 518, 555, 723, 899, 997, 1021, 1073,—eight in all. In 55 *δύο* is to be read with *μίαν*, and in

71 *σοι* should be emphatic, and is read with *δοκεῖ*, and 718 should begin *ἀλλ' εἰκε θυμῷ*; so that I omit these three verses. Rejecting, as before, in the first group 307, 407, 473, 515, 658, 733, 764, 1012, we have eight left; and in the second group we reject all but 1021, thus leaving the ratio 8:1. And in 327 (continuous), 555 (emphasis on *ζῆν*), and 899 (*σοι* emphatic), the removal of the caesura from the middle is not so violent as it is in any of the first group; consequently the above ratio should really be twice as large.

Finally, from EUR. *Elect.* I gather the following:

1. With elision after third foot, vv. 4, 14, 31, 64, 78, 96, 284, 305, 332, 504, 510, 555, 570, 642, 770, 782, 837, 980, 1008, 1012, 1036, 1065, 1087, 1262,—twenty-four in all.

2. Without elision: 43, 248, 1042, 1094,—four in all.

In the first group we reject 770, 837, 980, 1008, 1036, 1262, and in the second group all, leaving eighteen against none.

And yet these elisions at the middle of the verse, when main caesura is otherwise wanting, have been attributed to accident! These three plays are quite enough to show that, whether the author was conscious of it or not, he allowed this sort of diaeresis to pass for caesura. But I have gone further and examined all the plays of the three great Tragedians, omitting the *Cyclops*, but including *Rhesus*; and the following tables show the result:

1. Including all possible cases:

	With elision:	Without elision:	Percentages:	
Aeschylus,	89 instances;	39 instances.	69+	31—
Sophocles,	150 “	53 “	74	26
Euripides,	315 “	101 “	76	24

2. Excluding all doubtful cases:

	With elision:	Without elision:	Percentages:	
Aeschylus,	42 instances;	19 instances.	69—	31+
Sophocles,	44 “	9 “	83	17
Euripides,	123 “	1 (?) “	99	01 (?)

I have omitted Aristophanes because of the uncertainty of the caesurae in Comedy.

In excluding doubtful cases, I took no note of verses which have diaeresis after the first dipody in lieu of caesura, and it

is the considerable number of these that apparently increases the instances without elision in Aeschylus in both tables.

In Euripides the only examples of verses with diaeresis in the middle without elision and without any break at one of the places for the principal caesura, are *Hel.* 86, and *Bacch.* 1125. But the former verse is corrupt, having in the MSS. an anapaest in the fourth place; and, by the way, it has a good caesura in the fourth foot; but the critics, in removing the anapaest, destroyed the caesura. Such an "emendation" is utterly unworthy of consideration. The other verse is:

λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλέαις ἀριστερὰν χέρα.

This being the only instance, one is tempted to remove it by writing ὠλέαισ'.

The statistics show that in Euripides a limit was attained, or nearly attained, towards which we see a tendency in passing from Aeschylus to Sophocles.

In collecting the examples I observed a few facts to which I call attention. 1. Verses which have diaeresis with a pause in the middle, especially when there is no elision, very frequently have one or more of the following peculiarities:

(a) There is an antithesis between the two parts. This may be expressed by μὲν . . . . δὲ . . . as *Antig.* 555:

σὺ μὲν γὰρ εἶλον ζῆν, ἐγὼ δὲ κατθανεῖν—

(Cf. *SOPH.* *Oed. Rex* 785, *Elect.* 1036, *Philoct.* 503, 1009, 1021; *EUR.* *Rhes.* 161, *Hippol.* 313, *Phoen.* 521, *Ion* 742, *Hel.* 575, *Iph. Aul.* 827, etc.; and with elision, *AESCH.* *Prom.* 500; *SOPH.* *Oed. Rex* 1163, *Elect.* 696, *Philoct.* 359, 676; *EUR.* *Alcest.* 625, *Med.* 1141, *Hec.* 497, *Hel.* 49;) or it may be expressed by ὅτε . . . τότε . . . , or in some other way, as *AESCH.* *Theb.* 1046, *Pers.* 251, *Suppl.* 401, *Agam.* 1353, 1396; *SOPH.* *Ajax* 1377, *Antig.* 518, *Oed. Rex* 968, *Oed. Col.* 1038, *Elect.* 1038, *Philoct.* 907; *EUR.* *Alcest.* 789, *Androm.* 656, *Hec.* 232, 253, *Suppl.* 268, 379, *Heracl.* 424, *Hel.* 987, *Bacch.* 507, 682, 975, *Iph. Taur.* 674, *Iph. Aul.* 747, etc. In these cases the real caesura is generally found in its proper place, and the emphasis of antithesis causes the caesural pause.

(b) There is a long pause near the beginning. When this pause occurs, the rest of the verse is naturally read con-



tinuously, so that the mere break at the place for the principal caesura is sufficient, as Antig. 997:

τί δ' ἔστιν; ὡς ἐγὼ | τὸ || σὸν φρίσσω στόμα.

So Philoct. 736, Phoen. 1005, etc., etc.

(c) The arsis (ἄσις) of the third foot is a dissyllabic word, that is, it is resolved, and there is caesura in the foot, as Androm. 47:

ὅς δ' ἔστι παῖς μοι μόνος, || ὑπεκπέπω λάθρα.

The relative frequency of this in Euripides, where resolutions are frequent, leads to the suspicion that a computation might show it to be due to accident; but it is certainly striking, if we examine Orest. 1585, Phoen. 449, 846, Suppl. 1060, Herc. Fur. 321, 1181, Ion 742, 828, 1030, Hel. 267, 290, 1027, 1028, 1241, 1399, 1449, Elect. 43, 1084, Bacch. 297, 353, 841, 975, Iph. Taur. 371, 484, Iph. Aul. 747, etc.

2. (a) In Lyric passages when an occasional iambic trimeter occurs, as in other respects, so in regard to caesura, it is not subject to the laws of the ordinary verse; consequently I have omitted them in the count. As examples see Troad. 1305 and its corresponding verse 1320.

(b) A few verses present neither main caesura nor diaeresis, as AESCH. Suppl. 244, Pers. 501 (both — — — | ), SOPH. Ajax 969 ( — — — | with elision), Oed. Col. 373 ( — — — — | ), EUR. Suppl. 303 (which has a break in the middle, but pause after the second dipody).

As the collection of all these statistics was a mere *parergon* while I was reading the Tragedians for another purpose, I do not pretend that the figures I have given are absolutely correct. In fact, in some cases, I know that they are slightly erroneous; but they approximate the truth sufficiently to leave no doubt as to the correctness of the general result. I hold that I have fully established the fact that quasi-caesura must be recognized; and the explanation of it which I have given, it seems to me, is not only satisfactory, but is the only possible one. But we are not to imagine that the vowel exposed to elision received its full sound, and that a caesural pause was made in addition; for this would be like an anapaest with

caesura after its first syllable. The elided syllable was pronounced enough to render the first part of the verse somewhat similar to that of a verse having the main caesura in the fourth foot. The voice then passed rapidly on to the next word, unless the sense demanded a pause; and even when this was the case, the elided vowel, receiving a fuller pronunciation than was customary (as it was usual to suppress elided vowels entirely—elisions before long pauses being generally avoided), in a certain measure supplied the place of a pause. If the objection be made that this would make the verse like one having its caesura after the first syllable of an anapaest, I reply that this must be the case whether we recognize quasi-caesura or not, for it is universally admitted that before a strong punctuation an elision cannot be total. This sort of caesura, then, is rather of the sort which serves merely as a link or bond to hold the two parts of the verse together, than of the sort which gives the reciter a space to catch his breath in. So that the portion of the verse after the caesura is like that of a verse having no caesura, except that most probably the vowel (which is always short) following the elision suffered a partial aphaeresis. But in all cases the elided vowel and the one after it were so pronounced as not to interfere with the proper time of the foot.

An apparent difficulty is presented by those verses which have elision with a long pause at the ordinary penthemimeres; for if the slight pronunciation of an elided vowel at diaeresis creates caesura, why does not the same thing at caesura destroy it by creating diaeresis? The reason is found in the fact that the diaeresis in the middle of the verse is always followed by a single mora whose place is, in a manner, partly filled by the elided vowel, there being no ictus, whilst the penthemimeres is followed by a double mora with ictus, whose place cannot be even approximately supplied by the elided vowel. For instance in *Alcest.* 381:

*χρόνος μαλάξει σ'· οὐδέν ἐσθ' ὁ κατθανών,*

unless we slightly pronounce the elided vowel, we have *μαλάξεις*—which is hardly admissible; but the barely audible *ε* could not be mistaken for the arsis (*ῥέσις*) of the foot.

Still it somewhat impairs the flow of the verse, so that some of the Romans, who in almost all cases had only partial elision, appear to have avoided this elision. Hence, in the only ode of Horace composed entirely of trimeters (the last Epode), containing eighty-one verses, there is not a single instance of this elision, and it is very rare in the trimeters in his other odes, which odes were composed, as I shall presently show, under laws less strict in other respects than the last Epode. The rarity of elision at the caesura in Horace can hardly be attributed to accident; for in the twenty-ninth Ode of Catullus, containing twenty-four verses, there are seven such elisions, three of which precede a polysyllable, which is more objectionable than before an unimportant monosyllable. In Horace, on the other hand, there are in all the trimeters only two instances, one of which (Epod. V, 97, where *vicatim* loses its ultima), takes place to allow the ictus to fall on the first syllable (Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc. 1876, p. 121), and the other (VI, 11) is

cave, cave : namque in malos asperrimus,

where, even if we place the caesura after *namque*, we must read continuously, and when this is done, *-que* really suffers total elision, as will appear hereafter. It must indeed be admitted that Catullus allows more elisions in general than Horace does, but not so many more as to account for this disparity.

That elision at the main caesura is so frequent in Latin dactylic hexameters is no matter of surprise, because the feminine caesura is also admissible. These cases are not to be confounded with those where elision takes place at the end of the second foot before a monosyllable, so that this monosyllable is by the elision closely connected in sound with the preceding word, and so admits caesura after it, as HOR. Epist. II, 1, 46 :

Paullatim vello et || demo unum, demo et item unum.

(Or is this a kind of aphaeresis of the vowel of the monosyllable, which is usually *et*?) In other verses of sufficient length to make a breathing-place desirable, an elided vowel at this place was sounded a little even by the Greeks. Since this elision, frequently occurring in the *versus politicus*, as Nub. 1362 :

καὶ τὸν Σιμωνίδην ἔφασκ' || εἶναι κακὸν ποιητήν,

caused the first half to sound somewhat as if it had feminine caesura, this latter came actually to be admitted, as Nub. 1411:

οὐ καὶ μέ σοι δίκαιόν ἐστιν || εὐνοεῖν ὁμοίως;

and finally even with a long syllable, as Nub. 1366:

ἐγὼ γὰρ Δισχύλον νομίζω || πρῶτον ἐν ποιηταῖς.

But this one concession being made to the influence of elision, no further elision was tolerated at the feminine caesura. Again: even in the trochaic tet. cat., Aeschylus seems to have allowed elision, in one instance, to substitute apparent caesura for the otherwise universal diaeresis: Pers. 165:

ταῦτά μοι διπλῇ μέριμν' || ἄφραστός ἐστιν ἐν φρεσίν.

From all this it is evident that in iambic trimeters, quasi-caesura is to be expected after the *second* foot (as well as the third), provided some circumstance *compels* the reciter to sound the elided vowel; and this actually occurs, (1) when there is a long pause at the end of the first dipody, and (2) when at that point the verse is divided between two speakers. The former kind is of rare occurrence, especially in the Tragedians, since the latter portion of the verse was rather long, and, besides, the syllable following the elision is not necessarily a short one (as in the middle of the verse). Still I suspect that Hel. 818:

ἔρεϊ δὲ τίς μ'; οὐ γινώσεται γ' ὅς εἰμ' ἐγώ,

and a few other verses, such as Oed. Col. 1475, Trach. 449, 1136, 1208, Philoct. 1035, Ajax 969, etc., are of this kind.

Verses of the other sort are scarce, indeed, in the Tragedians (see Trach. 418), since they do not very often divide verses between actors, but in Aristophanes I find these instances: Lys. 911, Eccl. 1094, Ach. 832, Equ. 726, Aves 846, Nub. 726, 729, Pax 283, 367, Plut. 374. In my paper on Elision (1878) I called attention to the fact that, when elision seems to occur between two speakers, there is in fact no elision at all, but when the first speaker is uttering the vowel marked as elided, the second speaker utters his first syllable, there being not only no pause between them, but an actual overlapping. Hence, when there seems to be an elision of this kind after the first dipody, we really have the ordinary

penthemimeres, the overlapping being employed to secure quick retort, or sudden reply of some sort, thus (Ach. 832, Nub. 726) :

καὶ χαῖρε πολλά. ||  
 'Αλ || λ' ἀμὶν οὐκ ἐπιχώριον.  
 ἀπολεῖ κάκιστα. ||  
 'Αλ || λ' ὠγάδ' ἀπόλωλ' ἀρτίως.

Here the caesura took care of itself without any effort on the part of the first speaker, and hence this kind of caesura is as common at the end of the second as at the end of the third foot,—in fact more common in proportion as caesura in the third foot is more common than in the fourth.

## § 2. QUASI-CAESURA IN LATIN.

As the Romans were accustomed to hear vowels that were exposed to elision slightly pronounced, their ears were less delicate as to these vowels than were the ears of the Greeks, who were accustomed to the total suppression of elided vowels. Consequently, in Roman authors the quasi-caesura is not to be expected so frequently. But, as they always made elided vowels audible, if quasi-caesura occurs we may expect it occasionally after the *second* foot, no effort being required to produce it; but the fact that the latter portion of the verse is so long, and that the elision is usually followed by a long syllable (which cannot be represented by a diminished syllable), renders it rarer than at the middle of the verse. Accordingly there are a few examples of it in both places. But when the (apparent) elision takes place between two speakers, of course the same principle applies as in Greek, and we find not a few instances. (See *Casina* 352, 397, 509, etc.) In the other plays of Plautus it is not rare between two speakers. In Terence also we find a number of examples, as *Andria* I, 1, 7; I, 1, 92; II, 5, 5; IV, 4, 46; V, 3, 23; etc.

Sometimes the caesural pause seems to have prolonged a vowel exposed to elision into a whole *mora*, so that there was no need of this mora in the next word; whence arose hiatus at caesura, —a question too vexed for discussion here.

## § 3. PRINCIPLE UNDERLYING QUASI-CAESURA.

I have said that, in case of quasi-caesura in Greek, the reader, having passed to the middle of the verse without encountering caesura, unhesitatingly makes it at this point by slightly uttering the elided vowel, because he knows that it is the last chance for a main caesura. I now propose to illustrate this by giving some further applications of the same principle.

1. An iambic word (as Lachmann pointed out) rarely suffers elision in Latin, especially in dactylic hexameters, the cause no doubt being that the word would thereby be too much modified. (The elision sometimes occurs before *et* and rarely before other monosyllables; in which case I suspect aphaeresis rather than elision.) And when a reader has become accustomed to finding iambic words always unelided, he acquires the habit of boldly pronouncing them in full without reference to the following word. This gave the poets the opportunity of admitting hiatus after such words, as it removed one of the objections to hiatus—the danger of leading to a false reading. Consequently there is a considerable number of iambic words with hiatus, as “*nŏvō auctus hymenaeo*,” “*Sāmō; hic illius arma*.” For many examples see LACHMANN (ad LUCRET. III) and CORSSSEN (Ausspr. Voc. u. Bet. II, p. 785). Unless one is acquainted with this fact, he will hardly read correctly at the first attempt VERG. Geo. IV, 463:

atque Getae atque Hebrus et Actias Orithyia.

Also, when an iambic word is immediately preceded by the arsis, the final syllable may, for a like reason, be shortened before a vowel, as CATUL. CXIV, 6: *dum dŏmŏ ipse egeat*; OVID, Metam. III, 501: . . *vălē, vălē inquit*. Here the short syllables *dŏ-* and *văl-* force a short to follow.

2. The lengthening of a short syllable under ictus in hexameters is due to the same principle. For when you have read the thesis (*ἄρσις*), you know already that the long arsis (*ῥέσις*) must follow; so that you *make* the syllable long even though it be a short one; whilst, on the other hand, if you finish the arsis and find a short syllable after it, of course you pronounce it short expecting a dactyl, and this prevents the

composer from substituting a short for a long vowel in thesis—a thing which he can do in arsis without any danger of being misread. It is for this reason that *common* syllables (*διχρονoi*) also are made long much more frequently in arsis than thesis. The statement that the ictus lengthens a short syllable, if literally meant, is absurd. But for the difficulty mentioned, the lengthening would be much less of a license in thesis, for in arsis it is not only lengthened, but also receives special stress, which distorts the word all the more.

But in iambic verse, a short syllable cannot be lengthened under ictus (a good proof that ictus does not lengthen syllables); for the arsis may be resolved, and when you strike a short syllable you at once anticipate a resolution, and would go wrong were a short syllable put for a long one. For instance, if in the verse,

scis; feci ex servo ut esses libértús mihi,

you put ego for mihi, the reader would put a dactyl in the fifth place, and the verse would come out defective:

scis; feci ex servo ut essem libértús ěgo.

#### § 4. ELISION AT THE END OF A VERSE.

1. Of elision at the end of a verse no example is known to me in the case of Latin iambic trimeters. In Aeschylus I find no instance of it. In Sophocles it occurs, as far as I know, ten times (*Antig.* 1031, *Oed. Rex* 29, 332, 785, 791, 1184, 1224, *Oed. Col.* 17, 1164, *Elect.* 1017), six examples being in one play. It is confined to verses which are so connected grammatically with the next, as to forbid a pause; and, as was to be expected, the *syllaba anceps* is not admitted. Several of these verses end with *ẽ*, which some editors strangely transfer to the beginning of the next line, as if you would not have to read continuously in either case.

In Euripides there appear to be no examples. *Orest.* 1489 and *Elect.* 1184, in both of which it takes place before a pause, are not to be counted, as they are mere accidental trimeters in Lyric passages. This is the second feature in which we have found Lyric trimeters to differ from ordinary ones.

In Aristophanes I recall two examples (Aves 1716, Eccl. 351), in both of which δ' stands at the end, the preceding word being closely connected with the next line.

2. In Greek hexameters I do not know of any instances of elision at the end. Of course I take no notice of Nauck's attempt to banish -οις and -ης (Dat. pl. endings without final ι) from Homer, which attempt leads sometimes to -οισ' and -ησ' at the verse-end. In Iliad Θ 206, Ξ 265, Ω 331, Aristarchus wrote Ζῆν', and not Ζῆν'.

In Latin hexameters we find this elision occasionally under one of two conditions: (a) When the sense and grammatical structure allow no pause, then a vowel with -m, or a simple short vowel (especially in -que) may be elided. It is my opinion that, to insure a correct reading, the poets sometimes sought this elision, as VERG. Aen. VII, 160, X, 781:

Iamque iter emensi turris ac tecta Latinorum  
ardua cernebant iuvenes, muroque subibant.  
Sternitur infelix alieno volnere, coelumque  
adspicit, et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos.

Other examples are Aen. I, 448, V, 422, VI, 602, VIII, 228, XI, 609. Also, Geo. I, 295, which is the only one where the elision is not needed.

(b) When -que stands at the end and occurs again between the main caesura and the end, then the last -que may suffer elision, even before a pause, as VERG. Geo. II, 443, Aen. II, 745:

navigiis pinos, domibus cedrumque cupressosque;  
hinc radios trivere rotis, hinc tympana piaustris.  
Quem non incusavi amens hominumque deorumque,  
aut quid in eversa vidi crudelius urbe?

Other examples are Geo. II, 344, III, 242, 377, Aen. I, 332, IV, 558, 629, V, 753, VII, 470, IX, 650, X, 895. So OVID, Metam. IV, 11, 779, VI, 507, etc. The examples referred to in Vergil are exhaustive; so that it cannot be regarded as an accident that another -que is always found near the elided one. The cause is that the too frequent repetition of -que was unpleasantly monotonous, on which account the Romans often subjected one of them to this elision even at the verse-end, when it happened to be convenient. The aversion of the Roman ear to -que shows itself in several ways. Even



when not repeated it is exposed very often to elision in the body of the verse. This happens frequently at the main caesura, and especially before *et* (cf. HOR. Epist. II, 3, 145, 162, 165, 196, 199, etc.). Again, after Lucretius, it became rare after short *e* (Horace, in Sat. I, 1, 89, has *servāreque* amicos, *with elision*) ; and finally went out of use after words ending thus. Still another striking evidence of their aversion to the monotony above mentioned is found in the fact that, when *-que* is found two or more times in the same part of the verse, it is frequently lengthened in one of its positions. We often see it stated in the elementary Prosodies that *-que* is sometimes lengthened ; but I have never seen it stated *when* this occurs. Some speak, indeed, of its being lengthened before two consonants ; and in fact it does usually occupy this position when lengthened, but the consonants are generally a mute and a liquid, which very rarely cause position when initial. In fact even the *strong* position is exceptional in Latin when it acts on a final vowel of a preceding word. In Greek Comedy the weak position never lengthens a syllable, and even in Tragedy, a final vowel to secure quantity always takes *movable* *ν* (if it can) before the weak double consonants ; as Hel. 135, 656 : ὤλεσεν κλέος, ἤλπισεν βροτῶν, and in hundreds of other places in all Greek poetry. And, what is more to the point, Vergil and other Latin poets do not under these circumstances lengthen final syllables of other words. Rare exceptions occur, as CATUL. (in iambics) IV, 9 : Propontidā trucemve, etc. One example of *-quē* occurs before a simple *s* in Vergil (Aen. XII, 363) :

Chloreaquē Sybarimque Daretaque Thersilochumque,

where Wagner attributes to *s* the force of a double consonant ! He cites, by way of proof, Aen. III, 464 :—graviā sectoque elephantō. But if *s* had this weight, why do we meet no more instances of it ? Besides, every one knows that occasionally any final vowel (and especially neuter plural *-a*) is lengthened before a single consonant. And of the letters, *s* is least likely to have such an effect. In Ennius and Lucilius *final -s* with an initial consonant in the next word hardly ever makes position in thesis, and with its vowel is

elided very often. Cicero elided it in verse, and Catullus (CXVI, 8) drops it *before another s*. Priscian, on “*distinctă smaragdo*,” says: “*S enim in metro consonantis vim saepe amittit.*” Even in the middle of a word before a consonant it fails to make position not unfrequently in Plautus and Terence. It is the weakest of all the consonants, except final *m* before a vowel. Moreover, we have an example before *l* in Vergil (Aen. III, 91): *liminaquē laurusque*, etc.; and even before *p* in Ovid (Metam. VII, 225): *Othrysquē Pindusque*, etc. But, as I said, it usually precedes two consonants, as VERG. Ecl. IV, 51, Geo. I, 153:

*terrasquē tractusque maris, coelumque profundum.*  
*lappaequē tribulique, interque nitentia culta.*

The remaining examples in Vergil are Geo. I, 164, 352, 371, III, 385, IV, 222, 336, Aen. IV, 146, VII, 186, VIII, 425, IX, 767, XII, 89, 181, 363. In Ovid there are a good many instances, as Metam. III, 530, VIII, 526, etc.

The enclitic -ve, when repeated, also may suffer elision at the end, as HOR. Sat. I, 6, 102,—*rūsvē pērēgrēve* | *Exirem*, etc. When we consider all that has been shown about -que and -ve, and remember further that *neve* becomes *neu*, etc., and that -ne drops its -e sometimes even before a consonant, and that such forms as “*omniaque*” suffer elision in fifth foot of hexameters incomparably more than other words, we can hardly doubt that when these enclitics were exposed to elision, their vowel was *totally* suppressed.

When elision takes place at the end of a dactylic hexameter, the catalectic pause is destroyed by the continuity of the two verses, and so we can have no *syllaba anceps*, but the last foot must be an actual spondee. I am not disposed to insist on this, but apparent exceptions (such as VERG. Geo. II, 69, III, 449, Aen. XI, 333) have been removed not without ms. authority.

That the last syllable must be long after the elision has taken place is not disproved by the fact that, at the end of a Sapphic verse it may, under similar circumstances, be either long or short (cf. CATUL. XI, 19, 22: “*nullum anans vere, sed identem omnium* | *ilia rumpens*,” and “*qui illius culpa*

cecidit velūt prātum | ultimi flos," etc.); for the last foot in this verse may be either a trochee or a spondee, as is shown by comparing these two verses:

Gallicum Rhenum horribile aequor ūlti—mosque Britannos.  
Labitur ripa Jove non probānte ūr—orius amnis;

or in Greek:

πύκνα δινεῦντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνω ἄϊϑξ—ρος διὰ μέεσω.  
ἰζάνει καὶ πλασίον ἄδν φῶν ἔϊ—σας ὑπακούει.

Nor is anything proved by the well-known distichs:

Ἦ μέγ' Ἀθηναῖοισι φῶς γένεθ' ἡνίκ' Ἀρίστω-  
γείτων Ἰππαρχον κτεῖνε καὶ Ἀρμόδιος.  
Οὗτος δὴ σοι ὁ κλεινὸς ἄν' Ἑλλάδα παῖσαν Ἀπόλλο-  
δωρος· γιγνώσκεις τοῦνομα τοῦτο κλύων.  
Ἦκε δ' ὁμοῦ νόσων τε κακῶν ζωάγρια Νικό-  
μήδης, καὶ χειρῶν δεῖγμα παλαιγενέων.

For it is too plain that the poet, in these verses, was driven to his wit's end to get the proper name with one short syllable between two long ones into an elegiac distich at all. The reason that no such division of word is found at the end of a hexameter ending in a long syllable, is that such a word could be incorporated elsewhere into the verse.

### § 5. THE PORSONIC PAUSE.

The substance of the well-known law promulgated by Porson in his *Prolegomena ad Hecubam*, which is usually expressed in a rather clumsy way, is this: *caesura in the fifth foot must not be preceded by the long ultima of a polysyllable*; or, to make it applicable also to the trochaic tetrameter: *caesura cutting off three half-feet from the verse-end must not be preceded by a long ultima.* (By *polysyllable* I mean a word of *more than one* syllable.) If the break is followed by an enclitic, the caesura is not so decided; so that some exceptions occur in this case, but not the tenth of what would naturally occur. Hence we infer that the enclitic was not regarded as preventing the caesura—a fact which sustains my views before expressed with regard to main caesura before an enclitic. The law applies to some extent, as was observed by Elmsley (*Review of Porson's Hecuba*), when the caesura is

preceded by a long monosyllable which is more closely connected with what goes before than with what immediately follows. If it is a postpositive word, the offense is still greater, and if it is an enclitic, the offense is next to that of a full violation. Similarly, if a postpositive word follows the caesura, the offense is greater if it is not enclitic, but not so great as if it were not postpositive, and the offense of a proclitic approximates that of a trisyllabic word at the end. Hermann denies that the postpositive character of a word after the caesura excuses a violation of the law, except where *ἄν* is separated by the caesura from a verbal form suffering elision, as *εἵπομε' | ἄν τότῃ*. My theory, however, that elision in Greek was ordinarily a total suppression of a final vowel, leading to a close connection of the two words (as *τὸν ἄνδρ' ὀρῶ*, *ὑπ-λ' ἀφαιρέϊν*, etc.) led me to expect to find occasional violations of the Porsonic law excused by elision, even though the word following should not be postpositive; for whatever be the reason for the rule, it has reference to a *pause* or *break* between words. My search for examples was at first almost fruitless; but finally I went to the old editions and ms. readings, and found my theory fully sustained. Since my investigation I have found that Munk had already stated that the rule does not hold "*wenn ein apostrophirtes Wort zur Verknüpfung mit dem folgendem zwingt.*" Of course, under the *partial elision* theory, this announcement went unheeded. To show to what extent elision had influence, it will be necessary to collate the principal exceptions to the rule, and briefly discuss the commonly received views, as first set forth by Hermann.

In the first place, though convenient, it is not accurate to speak of the forbidden *spondee*, for it has not even the form of a spondee, but of an anapaest, when the arsis of the fourth foot is resolved. Thus, if in Bacch. 495,

ἔπειτα θύρσον τόνδε πᾶράδος ἐκ χερῶν,

we substitute *παράδο̃ς* for *παράδος*, the Porsonic law is violated. One violation of this sort occurs in MSS., Ion 22:

φρούρω παραζεύξασα φύλακᾶς σώματος,

where Porson very properly wrote *φύλακε*.

Again, all the apparent violations where  $\eta\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  and  $\iota\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  precede the pause are to be removed by writing  $\eta\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  and  $\iota\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  or  $\eta\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  and  $\iota\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$ . Dindorf calls attention to the possibility of this change, and yet he does not make it in his text. Aeschylus has one instance, Prom. 821,— $\eta\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  |  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}$   $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu$ ; but there is another instance of the short ultima in Eumen. 347,— $\acute{\epsilon}\phi'$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta$ , where the verse demands this quantity. In Sophocles these forms are quite common before the Porsonic pause, as Oed. Rex 1482; Oed. Col. 25, 34, 81, 1038, 1167, 1408, Elect. 1328, 1332, Philoct. 531; but the short ultima is met at every turn in other parts of the verse, and it looks strange to see in Dindorf's text (Oed. Rex 1482) the ending  $\iota\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$  |  $\tilde{\omega}\delta'$   $\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu$ , and two lines lower down (1484), the beginning,  $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\iota\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\tilde{\omega}$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu'$ ,  $\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ .

In Euripides there seems to be no shortening of this ultimate, and consequently these forms are not admitted before the Porsonic pause. One exception appears to occur in his Fragments (Dind. 711); but the verse is quoted by Aristophanes who, it is well known, frequently fails to reproduce the exact words.

Hermann, looking upon hephthemimeres as almost a fault, thought it required another pause in the latter part of the verse, so as to make this part more nearly equal to the first part. Hence he divides thus when this ( $3\frac{1}{2}$ ) caesura occurs :

$\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\tilde{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\nu\iota\nu$ , |  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\rho\acute{o}\iota$  |  $\alpha\nu$   $\tau'$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ .

This theory he applies in explaining certain violations of the rule in question. In fact it looks as if he got up the theory for this purpose; and he would have you believe that the neglect of the rule was intentional, in order to increase the weight, so to speak, of the latter part of the verse. Under certain circumstances, the presence of the hephthemimeres *does* seem to excuse a violation of the rule, but the violation could not have been sought, for then we certainly should have had more instances. The explanation of the simultaneous presence of hephthemimeres and disregard of the rule is mainly due to the fact that a trisyllable preceding the pause causes the objectionable *diaeresis in the middle*, and quadrisyllables of the suitable form ( $\approx \smile \text{ --- }$ ) are rare, and

hence only the dissyllable ( — — ) is left, and this creates hephthemimeres. With a *monosyllable* there, the law ordinarily does not apply. There are, however, two ways in which the hephthemimeres might have failed to exist, the one when there is quasi-caesura, the other when a monosyllable follows the penthemimeres; and instances of both these actually occur in the few examples cited by Hermann (Ion 633, quasi-caesura, and Iph. Aul. 1212, monosyl.):

ἂ δ' ἐνθάδ' εἶχον ἀγάθ', || ἄκουσόν μου, πάτερ.  
πεῖθειν ἐπάρδουσ', || ὦ σ θ' ὁμαρτεῖν μοι πέτρας.

And the hephthemimeres, accordingly, is very common, when a polysyllable ending in a *short* syllable precedes caesura in the fifth foot, although the Porsonic law is then intact. But Hermann calls attention to the fact that often the caesura has a long pause. In the first place this is not so frequently the case as he assumes; for he puts a strong pause where he would not otherwise have placed it, as after εἶρπ' in Rhes. 715:

βίον δ' ἀπαιτῶν, εἶρπ' ἀγύρτης τις λάτρης.

(This particular example, however, is lyric, and proves little of itself; but it serves to illustrate.) And so, frequently, when the Porsonic pause is followed by an enclitic. But when it is followed by γάρ, μέν, οὖν, and other postpositive non-enclitic words, there generally is a pause at the hephthemimeres. But this seems to me to be chiefly due to the fact that these particles generally have a pause preceding them by a word or two. Hence we generally find the pause whether the law is violated or not, as, with violation, Trach. 932:

ιδῶν δ' ὁ παῖς ὤμωζεν· ἔγνω γὰρ τάλας—

and without violation, Antig. 771:

οὐ τήν γε μὴ θιγοῦσαν· εὖ γὰρ | οὖν λέγεις.

(Cf. Antig. 96, 255, 270, 407, 448, 478, 567, 989, 1023, 1043, 1103, 1165, 1255, 1302.) Besides, Aristophanes, who certainly disregarded the law, has hephth. like the Tragedians, when he has Porsonic pause. Still it may be that the pause, allowing the reciter to catch breath, justified the non-observance of the rule. For, although I cannot see why comic

actors should be presumed to have better lungs than tragic actors, still we know that harder tasks were imposed upon them, and so, for want of a better, we accept Hermann's (and others') explanation of the law, viz., that it was to prevent too heavy a drag when the lungs of the speaker were nearly exhausted. If they had time to catch breath near the middle, the observance of the law, then, became less necessary.

I now proceed to examine all the violations, as far as I know them ; and it will become quite evident that elision is one of the principal causes of disregarding the law. In collecting examples I have been greatly aided by ELMSLEY'S *Review of Porson's Hecuba*. (To collect examples would be the simplest thing in the world if the ms. readings had not been tampered with.) I shall first briefly allude to instances which have no apparent excuse, or at least, one that was not much applied. The emendations to most of these seem to have sufficient ground. In Pers. 321, *proper names* are concerned. In Rhes. 731, the same thing seems to occur ; but the correct division into verses removes it. In AESCH. Suppl. 198, and one or two other verses, the origin of the false reading is evident. Oed. Col. 664, which a preposition seems to excuse, was changed by Porson. Οὐδέεις and οὐδέεν, changed by Porson into οὐδ' εἰς and οὐδ' ἔν, occur in Oed. Col. 1022, Alcest. 671, Phoen. 747, and Herc. Fur. 1338 (*spurious?*). Trach. 1136, had quantity before *μνωμένη*—changed by Heath to *μωμένη*. Philoct. 533 had *προσκύσαντες* (referring to *two*)—changed to dual ; 731 was changed before law was known ; Rhes. 928, Androm. 346, Hec. 729, Heracl. 640, Herc. Fur. 933, Ion 22, Iph. Aul. 530, 1456, and a few others in Euripides have received obvious emendations. For Ion 1, see Dindorf. Iph. Aul. 665 is manifestly corrupt, the verse being defective. In Androm. 346 and Hec. 729, where there is quantity before ψ (in *ψεύδομαι*), Dindorf accepts the emendations, but in Iph. Aul. 530, he retains *κῆτα* | *ψεύδομαι*, but rejects the whole passage. Munk retains all three, regarding the quantity *by position* as being less effective. In the Fragments of Euripides, 364, 2, Porson changes *κάποσώσαις* to *κάποσώσαι* ; 364, 28, is doubtful ; Witzschel's reading of 499, 4, is unworthy of notice ;

in 594, 3 (ἐμῇ γὰρ ἤλθε μητρὶ κεδνῇ πρὸς λέχος) Conington writes κεδνὸν εἰς λέχος,—received by Dindorf; 699 was no doubt modified by Aristophanes, by whom it is quoted; the verse (—κάμνειν; | κατθανεῖν) in Plutarch, referred by Valckenaer (ad Phoen. 1331) to EUR. *Palamedes*, need not be considered; 707,—τί χορῇ | εἶπατε is quoted by Aristophanes, where τί throws doubt on the passage; 773 has τοῦτο (for τούτου) in MSS.; in 1019 πολλὰ (for πολλήν) is found in one MS., and is to be retained as being the more obscure reading; in 1065, 3,—μεταμέλειαν | λαμβάνει, the emendations (Heimsoeth ἀλφάνει, Meineke μεταμέλεια) appear to be quite arbitrary. The fact, however, that relatively so large a number occur in quoted fragments casts doubt upon their accuracy.

The great body of instances of disregard of the law, nearly all of which are genuine, but have been much tampered with, I take up in this order: 1, Where there is elision; 2, an enclitic; 3, γάρ, μέν, οὖν, etc., after pause; 4, enclitics and post-positive words before pause; and I shall include the trochaic tet. cat.

1. First, then, where there is elision:

ÆSCH. Suppl. 752: καλῶς ἂν ἡμῖν ξυμφέροι ταῦτ', ὦ τέκνα, where Elmsley writes τὰδ'; in fact he always writes τὰδ' and τόδ' when he finds ταῦτ' and τοῦτ', although he is compelled to leave τοῦδ' (as Oed. Rex. 219) and τῶνδ' (as Iph. Aul. 895), etc., unchanged.

ÆSCH. Pers. 762: ἐξ οὔτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἀναξ τήνδ' ὥπασεν.

SOPH. Ajax 1101: ἔξεστ' ἀνάσσειν, ὦν ὁδ' ἡγεῖτ' οἰκοθεν; Pors. ἡγεν, others ἡγετ'.

“ Oed. Rex 219: ἀγὼ ξένος μὲν τοῦ λόγου τοῦδ' ἐξερω.

“ Oed. Col. 505: τοῦκεῖθεν ἄλσους, ὦ ξένη, τοῦδ' ἦν δέ του—: changed by Elmsley.

“ Elect. 413: εἰ μοι λέγοις τὴν ὕψιν, εἰποίμ' ἂν τότε.

“ Trach. 718: πῶς οὐκ ὀλεῖ καὶ τόνδε; δόξη γ' οὖν ἐμῇ—(γούν?).

“ Philoct. 22: ἃ μοι προσελθὼν σῖγα σήμαιν' εἶτ' ἔχει. All efforts to change this, as far as I know, have failed.

EUR. Alcest. 1080: ἔγνωκα καὐτός· ἀλλ' ἔρω τίς μ' ἐξάγει: Elms. τις ἐξάγει.

“ Hippol. 294: γυναικες αἶδε συγκαθίσταντ' ἂν νόσον; MSS. συγκαθίστανται, etc.



- EUR. Androm. 875 : προδοὺς ἑάσει δωμάτων τῶνδ' ἐκπεσεῖν.  
 “ “ 935 : βλέπουσ' ἂν αὐγὰς τὰμ' ἔκαρπουτ' ἂν λέχη.  
 “ “ 1184 : οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῶνδ' ἐτιμᾷτ' ἂν, γέρον.  
 “ Troad. 464 : οὐκ ἀντιλήψεσθ', ἢ μεθήσεσθ', ὦ κακαί; where  
 Musgrave and others have μεθήσετ'.  
 “ Orest. 91 : οὕτως ἔχει τάδ', ὥστ' ἀπείρηκ' ἐν κακοῖς : Pors.  
 ἀπείρηκεν.  
 “ “ 615 : μαῖλλον δ' ἐκείνη σοῦ θανεῖν ἐστ' ἀζία, and  
 “ Bacch. 246 : ταῦτ' οὐχὶ δεινῆς ἀγχόνης ἔστ' ἀζία, in which  
 verses Elms. proposed ἐπαζία, ἐπάζια, and Dindorf  
 accepts.  
 “ Phoen. 522 : ζεύγνυσθε δ' ἵππους, πεδία πίμπλασθ' ἀρμάτων :  
 Pors. πίμπλαθ'.  
 “ Phoen. 1619 : ἀλλ' ἔτι νεάζων αὐτὸς εὐροίμ' ἂν βίον ;  
 “ “ 1626 : ἐγὼ δὲ ναίειν σ' οὐκ ἑάσαιμ' ἂν χθόνα.  
 “ Heracl. 456 : μάλιστα δ' Εὐρυσθεύς με βούλοισ' ἂν λαβών—  
 “ “ 529 : καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ, which  
 Porson does not mention, and Dindorf is unable to  
 change.  
 “ Ion 1016 : εἰς ἔν δὲ κραθὲν ταυτὸν ἰχῶρ' εἰσφέρεις, well  
 changed into εἰς ἔν δὲ κραθὲντ' αὐτὸν, ἢ χωρὶς, φορεῖς.  
 “ “ 1426 : ἔστιν τι πρὸς τῷδ', ἢ μόνω τῷδ' εὐτυχεῖς ;  
 “ Hel. 1628 : οἵπερ ἡ δίκη κελεύει μ' ἀλλ' ἀφίστασθ' ἐκποδῶν :  
 Pors. ἀφίστασ'.  
 “ Bacch. 1272 : κλύοις ἂν οὖν τι κάποκρίναί' ἂν σοφῶς.  
 “ Iph. Aul. 380 : ὡς ἀδελφὸν ὄντ'· ἀνὴρ γὰρ αἰσχροὺς αἰδεῖσθ' οὐ  
 φιλεῖ, where Markland puts χρηστὸς αἰδεῖσθαι  
 φιλεῖ. Some change was needed.  
 “ “ 523 : ὃν μὴ σὺ φράξεις, πῶς ὑπολάβοιμ' ἂν λόγον ;  
 “ “ 635 : ἐγὼ δὲ βούλομαι τὰ σὰ στέρν', ὦ πάτερ : Dind.  
 rejects.  
 “ “ 858 : δοῦλος. οὐχ ἀβρίνομαι τῷδ'· ἡ τύχη γάρ μ' οὐκ  
 ἔῃ : Elms. γὰρ οὐκ.  
 “ “ 895 : Μενέλεως ἀφείλεθ' ἡμᾶς, ὅς κακῶν τῶνδ' αἵτιος :  
 Pors. τῶνδ' ὅς αἵτιος κακῶν.  
 “ Frag. 1045, 5 : οὐδ' ἂν γένοιτο γράμμα τοιοῦτ' ἐν γραφῇ,  
 changed by Nauck.

I have omitted such cases as Trach. 592,—ὡς οὐδ' | εἰ δοκεῖς ;  
 for it does not matter how closely a word bears upon a mono-

syllable before the pause, the rule does not apply, if that monosyllable bears upon what follows. Hence, there are many such endings, as SOPH. Elect. 574—οὐδ' εἰς | Ἰλιον, 596—ὡς τὴν | μητέρα, 1411—ἀλλ' οὐκ | ἐκ σέθεν. Cf. Oed. Rex 388, 515, Oed. Col. 1443, 1646, Philoct. 385, Rhes. 418, 765, Alcest. 320, Hippol. 79, Androm. 378, Hec. 592, Heracl. 181, 255, 270, etc., etc. (All these, by the way, sustain my theory that a break between a proclitic and the next word is not to be disregarded in discussing caesura; for here it is clear that the two are *not* rhythmically one word.)

In the examples collected above, it will be seen that there are many instances of *äv* with elision. Let it now be observed that in all the Tragedians, to the best of my knowledge, *there is no instance of äv without elision* in such positions; and it was quite easy for the poets to construct such endings, and they would certainly have done it by accident, had they not avoided it. The frequency of elision where there is no *äv* cannot be the result of accident either, and it shows clearly that we are not, without some other sufficient ground, to attempt to make emendations. It would be a strange thing if so large a per cent. of corrupt exceptions to the rule *happened* to have elision.

2. I shall merely refer to other violations of the Porsonic law, without quoting them in full. The instances where the pause is limited by an enclitic, as in

τί παρθενεύει δαρὸν ἔξον | σοι γάμου,

are AESCH. Prom. 648, Agam. 1052, Choeph. 903; SOPH. Ajax 995 (?), Oed. Col. 982, Elect. 432, Philoct. 593, 788, 801; EUR. Rhes. 715 (lyric), 868, Alcest. 1085, Hec. 507, Orest. 111, Heracl. 516, Ion 633, Hel. 471, Elect. 1119, Iph. Taur. 942, Iph. Aul. 1207, 1212, Frag. 126. (Frag. 794, 4, is corrupt.) In Agam. 1052, Elmsley reads *πεῖθε | νιν λόγγ* for *πεῖθω κτέ*; Alcest. 1085, Valckenaer *ἡβάσκει κακόν* for *ἡ ᾗ | σοι κακόν*; Iph. Taur. 942, *ἐνθέν | μοι πόδα* variously emended; Iph. Aul. 1207 changed by Porson:—only *four* attempts at emendation in *twenty-three* examples. If the commentators had spared those which have elision as much as they did these, the condition of the texts would be much better.

3. The following verses have μέν, γάρ, etc. immediately after the Porsonic pause, with objectionable preceding spondee, as in

σὺ δ' ἡμῖν ἡ μισοῦσα μισεῖς | μὲν λόγῳ.  
 ἰδὼν δ' ὁ παῖς ῥῳξεν· ἔγνω | γὰρ τάλας—,

namely: AESCH. Prom. 107; SOPH. Oed. Rex 142, Oed. Col. 265, Elect. 357, Trach. 308, 932, Philoct. 422, 466, 596; EUR. Heracl. 303, Ion 954, Hel. 1552, Iph. Taur. 678, Iph. Aul. 391, 1146 (which has both ἀνακαλύψω | γὰρ λόγους and ἀνακαλύψομεν λόγους). To the other fourteen examples I have encountered no emendations.

4. When an enclitic or postpositive monosyllable *precedes* the Porsonic pause, as in

ὦ μῆτερ, ἡὔδας, ἦ πολύν σοι | βοστρύχων—,  
 ζητεῖ παρελθεῖν· τῶν κακῶν γὰρ | μητέρων—,

the rule has, among others, the following exceptions: SOPH. Elect. 376, Oed. Rex 435, Oed. Col. 115; EUR. Androm. 230, Troad. 1182, Phoen. 403, Elect. 275, Frag. 162, 2, Frag. 716 (Dind. σοί, Witzschel σοι). Phoen. 403, ἦν τις | δουτυχῆ, varies in mss. This list, being collected by a rapid perusal, cannot be exhaustive. The examples show two things: *first*, that in such cases the law did apply; but, *secondly*, that the offense was not so great as in polysyllables.

From all this we deduce the following conclusions:

1. *All* departures from the Porsonic Law, as I at first explained it, are to be regarded as exceptional.

2. These exceptions may take place under the following conditions:

- (a) When the break is followed by an enclitic, in which case there is frequently a weak hephthemimeral pause or quasi-caesura.
- (b) When the break is followed by a postpositive particle (μέν, γάρ, etc.), in which case there is generally, from the nature of the case, a strong hephthemimeral pause.
- (c) *When there is elision at the break, whether it be followed by a postpositive word (äv), or not.* This is the only excuse for a real polysyllable with long ultima followed by a real or virtual amphimacer. There is, in this case, no restriction as to caesura, because the elision

renders a word foot of any possible form admissible before the break. The pause is always short enough to allow *total* elision.

- (d) NOTE: When, instead of a polysyllable, a postpositive or enclitic monosyllable *precedes* the break, the law is not so rigorous.

#### § 6. THE PORSONIC PAUSE IN LATIN.

The Roman Dramatists did not observe the Porsonic law, the structure of their verse with respect to quantity being looser even than that of the Greek Comedy, where the rule does not hold. The statement which I have seen that Catullus carefully observed the rule, is somewhat ridiculous, as his senarii are all pure, rendering a violation of the law impossible. Horace, in Epode XVII, observed the law; but in v. 10 is a violation, an *anapaestic* word coming before the break. It is true, there is elision in this case, but the effect of this elision in Latin is not the same as in Greek. In Epode XVI the senarii being pure, and other Epodes containing no violation being very short, we conclude that Horace, with the above exception, neglected the law. Of course, when the law is violated, you will generally find the hephthemimeres, for the reason already stated, the exceptions being when there is a word of the form — ∪ — — — before the break, or a monosyllable of proclitic nature (so as to prevent diaeresis in the middle) followed by the word foot ∪ — — —, as Epode V, 17, XI, 27:

iubet sepulcris || caprificos erutas.  
Sed alius ardor || aut puellae candidae.

This makes it, if possible, still more evident that this ( $3\frac{1}{2}$ ) caesura came *unsought*, for Horace did not feel himself under the necessity of mitigating what he did not regard as an offense; for when I speak of violations of the law I mean merely what *would* be violations if any attempt were made to observe it. The long pause at the ( $3\frac{1}{2}$ ) caesura is not so frequent as in the Greek Tragedies; but the cause of the pause in Greek (γὰρ, μὲν, etc.) did not exist in Latin. Still, as I said before, there was probably some mitigation in the pause,

although it thus originated; that is, the pause renders possible a violation of the law.

In Latin, elision would be no mitigation, as the elided word was not entirely suppressed.

In Seneca, the phenomena attending caesura in the fifth foot stand in no relation whatever to those in Greek. He seems to have desired a cumbersome ending. Elision, indeed, is common, but, as I said, is no mitigation, for that is exactly what he did not wish, as the facts will show. In *Herc. Fur.* a word ending in a *trochee* never precedes the break, whether there is elision or not, nor does a *short* monosyllable nor a dactyl without elision ever precede the break; that is, we never find the forms  $\cup | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \cup | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \cup (\cup) | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \cup \cup | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ; but only  $\text{---} | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \text{---} | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \cup \cup (\text{---}) | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ ,  $\text{---} \text{---} (\text{---}) | \text{---} \cup \text{---}$ , and, in the play mentioned, in such manner that we find

Total caesurae without elision,	20
“ “ with “	129
Violations of Pors. law without elision,	11
“ “ “ with “	59

Conformity to Pors. law as nearly as possible, 0 (!)

From this it is evident that he was fond of elision at the break, or of anything else that would make the ending drag.

## § 7. RELATIONS OF ELISION TO ACCENT.

In composing verse, two things must be observed: *first*, each verse must preserve its proper feet, caesura, rhythmical accents (ictus),—in short, everything that distinguishes it from other verses; that is, *regard must be had to the form of the verse*. *Secondly*, the words which form a verse, must not, in order to become adapted to the verse, be distorted too much in their pronunciation; that is, *regard must be had to the words and the sense*. If an awkwardly composed verse be so read that its metrical form shall be preserved, the sense is lost and the words sound ridiculous. If, on the other hand, such a verse is read according to the form of the words and the sense, no one will suspect that it is a verse at all. Now this paper has only dealt with *the form of the verse*. But the

*form of the words, and the sense*, are also concerned with elision. In Latin, for instance, it enables the ictus or stress of voice to fall on the root-syllable, as in

ita mē vetūstas āmplexu, ānnorū ēnecāt,

since āmplexū, (especially in the second and fourth places) would distort the form of the word too much. So in dactylic hexameters, the ending  $\sim \text{—} | \sim \sim \text{—} \text{—}$  is to be avoided, while it is more admissible (though not much, for another reason) with elision:  $\sim \text{—} (\sim) | \sim \sim \text{—} \text{—}$ .

These are mere illustrations. The whole subject of accent and ictus in trimeters is discussed in *Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc.* for 1876; and for hexameters, the subject is discussed in *Transactions* for 1878.

#### IV.—*Studies in the Heliand.*

By ALBERT S. COOK,

ASSOCIATE-PROFESSOR FOR ENGLISH IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Since the *Heliand* was first made accessible to scholars in general by the publication of Schmeller's edition in 1830, a number of editions have appeared, and several critical and exegetical essays of high worth have contributed to its elucidation, especially in what relates to its age, origin, and place in literature. A general survey of these productions has been given in the last and most complete edition of the *Heliand*, that of Eduard Sievers, which, anxiously awaited by his fellow craftsmen, at length issued from the press early in 1878.

Sievers, by printing the carefully collated text of both MSS. upon opposite pages, and accompanying it with the prose passages on which the poetical version is founded, has deserved well of all Germanists; but he has gone much farther: for, however the conception of the alliterative formula or of the poetical formula in general may be modified by future investigators, it is undeniable that he has, with much